

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE E-15

WASHINGTON POST
6 JANUARY 1983

JACK ANDERSON

CIA Director Wrongly Tied To Renegade

The staff director of the House Intelligence Committee chose to call a mysterious episode in the murky career of convicted gun-runner Edwin P. Wilson "The Stansfield Turner Affair."

The label is unfair. The former CIA director committed no impropriety; he didn't even know he was being linked to Wilson, who was a fugitive ex-CIA agent at the time. Here's what happened:

In early 1978, Turner was having a house built in suburban Washington. As head of the CIA, he required a security system for his new home.

"The builder gave me the choice of several security systems," Turner told my associate Dale Van Atta. He said he chose Honeywell because an old friend was a top executive of the company.

Unbeknownst to Turner, a one-time associate of Wilson also worked at Honeywell, as sales manager for its protective services division. One day this man got a call from Wilson. He later told the Intelligence Committee he "was instructed by Ed to have someone from Honeywell con-

tact Stansfield Turner" about an alarm system for the CIA chief's home.

The sales manager assumed Wilson was acting at Turner's behest. Like many people, he thought Wilson was still working for the CIA—an impression Wilson cultivates to this day.

So the former associate asked Gar Woodward, a retired colonel who still works at Honeywell, "to contact someone at Turner's office, one of his liaison people, and arrange to look at the house . . . and see what it needs." Woodward, like Turner, knew nothing of the Wilson connection.

Wilson's associate told the House committee behind closed doors that Turner got at least a 50 percent discount on the security system, and that it was also "paid for out of petty cash from CIA funds." Both Woodward and Turner say they were unaware of any discount; both vehemently deny that the CIA paid for the job.

In fact, Turner produced the building contract for his home, which shows an estimate of \$1,800 for a security system as part of the construction cost. Turner recalled that, when the actual cost turned out to be \$1,950, he paid the additional \$150 through an adjustment in the closing costs. The CIA's only involvement was to see that the system was connected to CIA headquarters in Langley, Va.

What remains a mystery is how Wilson knew Turner was looking for a home-security system. The most likely conclusion is that someone in the CIA's "old boy network" found out about it from the CIA's office of security, and mentioned it to Wilson.

It would be typical of Wilson to use this information to nurture the idea that he was still a CIA man. He made his fortune through good connections, and seized every opportunity to "legitimize" himself by real or perceived intimacy with the great and the near-great.

One thing is clear: Turner had no idea Wilson had any involvement with Honeywell. The two were "like oil and water," according to a knowledgeable source. Turner's major housecleaning at the CIA began when he fired two agents who were moonlighting for Wilson.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A1

WASHINGTON POST
5 January 1983

Arms Talks Chief Assails GOP Critics

By Patrick E. Tyler
Washington Post Staff Writer

U.S. arms control director Eugene V. Rostow yesterday accused some Republican conservatives in the Senate of attempting to take over nuclear arms control policy by challenging key presidential appointments and endangering the Reagan administration's credibility in negotiations with the Soviet Union.

Following a White House decision Monday against renominating Robert T. Grey Jr. as deputy director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), Rostow said "the next few appointments" in the vacancy-riddled agency will demonstrate whether "we retain control in the agency and have personnel in the agency representing a continuing point of view."

In coming weeks, as the administration prepares for the resumption of nuclear arms reduction talks in Geneva, Rostow said, the agency will not be hampered by unfilled positions. For now, he said, he is optimistic that the Senate conservatives who have blocked Rostow's choices to ACDA positions "are not having any effect on the formation of policy" and that "policy is being made in accordance with the president's ideas."

Rostow said that he did not wish to state his accusation toward the Senate con-

servatives in "naked" terms, but added that a minority of Senate Republicans led by Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), who successfully scuttled the Grey appointment and one other major appointment last year, are seeking a level of influence in arms control policy not warranted by their numbers.

He said the threat of such disproportionate influence could promote a "fear response" from the Soviet Union "over the credibility of American guarantees or lead to extreme nationalism" to counter a greater perceived threat from the United States.

"The Soviets can try to exploit the doubts, and they get very anxious at the thought that any extremist American group might take charge of American nuclear policy," Rostow said.

He said that the difficulty of his job has been to chart a course between "people who want an agreement with the Russians at any price . . . and people opposed to having any agreement at all."

Rostow called the loss of Grey "a sad comment on the political process," but sources on Capitol Hill and in the administration said yesterday that the battle over Reagan administration foreign policy appointments is likely to continue.

While some sources had suggested that abandonment of the Grey nomination in the face of strong opposition from Helms would ease opposition to other key appointments held hostage during much of 1982, aides to several conservative senators involved in the fight indicated otherwise.

They and administration officials said it now appears certain there will be a major confrontation in the Senate later this month over the expect-

ed renomination of Richard Burt as assistant secretary of state for European affairs.

Burt is seen by several conservatives as a potential moderating influence on a hard line toward the Soviet Union in arms negotiations.

Yesterday, an aide to Helms said he wasn't aware of any deals relating to the White House's decision to abandon Grey.

"There have been any number of so-called deals announced unilaterally . . .," he said. "But there never were any such deals, they just said, 'Here's the deal.'"

"I doubt very seriously whether Grey bought them much," said an aide to Senate Majority Leader Howard H. Baker Jr. (R-Tenn.). "The community opposing Grey and the community opposing Burt are not entirely the same."

Saying the current intention is to force the fight over the Burt nomination as soon as the Senate reconvenes, the aide added:

"At some point we've got to move on. The president and the secretary of state seem committed to the nomination, and we're going to do our best to get him through."

An aide to Sen. Malcolm Wallop (R-Wyo.) said yesterday that administration officials are "whistling in the dark" if they think opposition to Burt has abated. They have broadened the challenge to Burt to include "security" grounds stemming from an article he wrote in 1979 as a reporter for The New York Times.

That article revealed the existence of a U.S. spy satellite code-named Chalet that could be reprogrammed to monitor communications signals emanating from Soviet missile tests.

As a follow-up to a classified letter protesting the Burt appointment sent to Secretary of State George P. Shultz last summer by Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.), Republicans on

CONTINUED